

Message

From: McKaughan, Colleen [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F37EB6F19D09495190CAD9CCA9EE8F62-CMCKAUGH]
Sent: 6/6/2017 10:07:53 PM
To: Geselbracht, Jeanne [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=bc375806a9ea4394ba2418872dce3838-JGESELBR]
Subject: FW: Rosemont air issue

Hi, Jeanne,

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5 this is what I would say:

~~Air quality issues – The project may result in exceedance or near exceedance of the National Ambient~~

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

It looks like we had several concerns regarding the way the company did its air impact analysis, which are listed in the paragraph from Cleve below.

Colleen

From: Holladay, Cleveland
Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2017 2:54 PM
To: McKaughan, Colleen <McKaughan.Colleen@epa.gov>; Flagg, MichaelA <Flagg.MichaelA@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Rosemont air issue

Hi Colleen, Michael

There has not been any change that I know of that would change the response I provided on May 12, 2016 concerning predicted Rosemont impacts, which is included below.

“The proposed project and its alternatives (including the preferred alternative) are predicted to degrade regional visibility and increase airborne nitrogen deposition in excess of identified thresholds for a number of Class 1 areas, including Saguaro National Park. EPA recently required retrofitting of power generating facilities in the region to reduce their visibility impacts. Further project control/mitigation measures should be incorporated into updated modeling that predicts lower visibility impacts from these measures. EPA has continuing concerns about the way in which the project’s air impact analysis was performed and a number of key assumptions that were incorporated into that analysis. Some of these concerns are the following: maximum impacts beyond the fence line, use of three years of meteorological data instead of five years, the low NO2 background concentration and possible undocumented modifications to CALPUFF. Addressing these concerns sufficiently may result in predicted violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or relevant Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) increments.”

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

-Cleve

From: McKaughan, Colleen
Sent: Tuesday, June 06, 2017 11:59 AM
To: Flagg, MichaelA <Flagg.MichaelA@epa.gov>; Holladay, Cleveland <Holladay.Cleveland@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Rosemont air issue

Thank you!

From: Flagg, MichaelA
Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2017 11:58 AM
To: McKaughan, Colleen <McKaughan.Colleen@epa.gov>; Holladay, Cleveland <Holladay.Cleveland@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Rosemont air issue

Hi Colleen – just spoke to Cleve – he is going to take a look ASAP.

From: McKaughan, Colleen
Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2017 11:52 AM
To: Flagg, MichaelA <Flagg.MichaelA@epa.gov>; Holladay, Cleveland <Holladay.Cleveland@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Rosemont air issue

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Geselbracht, Jeanne
Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2017 11:49 AM
To: McKaughan, Colleen <McKaughan.Colleen@epa.gov>
Subject: Rosemont air issue

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Jeanne Geselbracht
Environmental Review Section (ENF-4-2)
U.S. EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Phone: (415) 972-3853